

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

These remarks are in response to the Official Action mailed March 26, 2004, in which claims 4-14 are finally rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Nordin, WO 96/10946 ("Nordin"). The Examiner asserts that Nordin is concerned with the creation of a mop comprising two cleaning surfaces. Further, the Examiner asserts that Nordin teaches a mop having micro fibers having a Dtex below 1 with the mop being woven or knitted to form short and long loops. Although the Examiner acknowledges that Nordin does not specifically teach the loop height included within the claims of the present application, the Examiner believes it would have been obvious to a person having ordinary skill in the art to modify the length of the loops.

Applicant respectfully traverses the Examiner's contention and notes that in contrast to a regular mop such as Nordin, which is designed for being immersed into a water-base washing medium, the present invention is directed to a dry mop. Therefore, a person skilled in the art, wishing to invent a more efficient dry mop would not turn to Nordin looking for inspiration.

Additionally, the independent claims of the present invention, i.e., claims 4 and 13, include a unique combination of a micro or ultra-micro fiber having a count of at a maximum .60 to a minimum .25 Dtex per fiber combined with a specific loop height. Specifically, claim 4 of the present invention, as amended, includes loops having a height between 3-9 mm, while claim 13 includes a loop height proportioned so that when the fabric is pressed against the surface underneath it, the loops remain upright or lay in an angle of no more than 45 degrees to an imaginary vertical line. No new matter has been added by the amendment to claim 4. Nordin does not teach

such a combination as inferred by the Examiner in the Official Action.

Additionally, Nordin actually teaches away from this limitation. Specifically, at page 5, lines 1-6, Nordin describes certain loops having shorter sides and a Dtex of less than 1 and defines them as microfilaments. Then, at page 6, lines 15, et seq., Nordin states that due to the extremely large fiber surface of the cloth and the shape of the separate microfilaments the friction against the support will be much too large for practical work during a longer period if the abutting surface consists completely of microfilaments. Nordin requires that the microfilaments be dispersed by longer loops. Thus, Nordin is insinuating that no matter how much experimenting one skilled in the art performed on a mop having microfilaments, the friction against the support surface would be too large unless long loops are interdispersed between the microfilaments.

Further, as previously stated, a person wishing to create or invent an improved dry mop having the specific recitations included within the claims of the present invention, would not use Nordin as a starting point as Nordin discloses a mop designed to be immersed in water. Even if one were to assume that a person skilled in the art should turn to Nordin for information regarding specific heights and Dtexs of the loops, the one skilled in the art would find no reference disclosing the specific recitations included within the claims of the present application, as Nordin does not disclose any such suitable height. Thus, the claims of the present invention should not be deemed to be obvious in view of Nordin.

Independent claim 6 is currently amended to correct a spelling error. No new matter has been added.

In view of the above, each of the presently-pending claims in this application is believed to be in immediate condition for allowance. Accordingly, the Examiner is

respectfully requested to withdraw the outstanding rejection of the claims and to pass this application to issue.

If, however, for any reason the Examiner does not believe that such action can be taken at this time, it is respectfully requested that the Examiner telephone applicant's attorney at (908) 654-5000 in order to overcome any additional objections which the Examiner might have.

If there are any additional charges in connection with this requested amendment, the Examiner is authorized to charge Deposit Account No. 12-1095 therefor.

Dated: September 27, 2004

Respectfully submitted,

By 

Raymond Garguilo, Jr.

Registration No.: 50,930

LERNER, DAVID, LITTENBERG,

KRUMHOLZ & MENTLIK, LLP

600 South Avenue West

Westfield, New Jersey 07090

(908) 654-5000

Attorney for Applicant

LD-446\

516662_1.DOC